

Manuscript version: Author's Accepted Manuscript

The version presented in WRAP is the author's accepted manuscript and may differ from the published version or Version of Record.

Persistent WRAP URL:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/108032>

How to cite:

Please refer to published version for the most recent bibliographic citation information. If a published version is known of, the repository item page linked to above, will contain details on accessing it.

Copyright and reuse:

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions.

Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Publisher's statement:

Please refer to the repository item page, publisher's statement section, for further information.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: wrap@warwick.ac.uk.

Experimental Investigation on Interply Friction Properties of Thermoset Prepreg Systems

Corentin Pasco*¹, Muhammad Khan², Jaipal Gupta¹, Kenneth Kendall¹,

¹ Automotive Composites Research Centre, WMG, The University of Warwick,

² Faculty of Engineering, Environment and Computing, Coventry University

*corresponding author email: c.pasco@warwick.ac.uk

Postal Address: WMG, The University of Warwick, International Manufacturing Centre, Gibbet Hill Road, Coventry CV4 7AL, United Kingdom

Abstract:

A comprehensive novel investigation into the characterisation of interply friction behaviour of thermoset prepregs for high-volume manufacturing (HVM) was conducted. High interply slipping rate and normal pressure typically used for HVM present challenges when preforming carbon fibre reinforced plastics (CFRP). The study involved multiple reinforcement architectures (woven and unidirectional (UD) with the same rapid-cure resin system) which were characterised using a bespoke interply friction test rig used to simulate processing conditions representative to press forming and double diaphragm forming. Under prescribed conditions, woven and UD prepregs exhibit significantly different frictional behaviour. Results demonstrated the UD material obeys a hydrodynamic lubrication mode. For the woven material, a rate-dependent friction behaviour was found at low normal pressure. At higher normal pressure however, the woven material exhibited a friction behaviour similar to that of a dry reinforcement and significant tow displacement was observed. Post-characterisation analysis of test-specimens showed significant resin migration towards the outer edges of the plies, leaving a relatively resin-starved contact interface. The findings generate new knowledge on interply friction properties of thermoset prepreg for HVM applications, yet reveal a lack of understanding of the influence of tow tensions as well as the pre-impregnation level for a range of processing conditions.

Keywords: Prepreg, Thermosetting resin, Preforming, Interply friction, High-volume manufacturing

1. Introduction

The increasing demand for fuel efficient vehicles has led to an increasing use of thermoset prepreg materials due to their high specific strength and stiffness. This has consequently created a need for more efficient, less labour and capital-intensive manufacturing processes, as opposed to the more traditional autoclave method. Latest development in resin technology has made it possible to compression mould thermoset prepreg, offering short cycle times while retaining the exceptional mechanical performance of autoclaved prepreg [1-3]. Similar to traditional manufacturing methods, one of the first steps of prepreg compression moulding (PCM) is the preforming of an initial flat blank of material into its final 3D shape. Preforming of thermoset material can be automated and is typically done using press-forming [4], or double diaphragm forming [5, 6], prior to the curing stage. Both methods involve preheating a thermoset prepreg blank in order to lower the resin viscosity and to ease the deformation. Temperature must be carefully controlled as initiation of resin cure would increase the stiffness of the prepreg and prevent the material from deforming. The preheated blank is then transferred into a press for preforming. Irrespective of the preforming method, processing parameters such as temperature and forming speed have a significant influence on the quality of thermoset prepreg preforms. Preforming is a critical stage as it influences the structural property of the final part. The initial flat blank of prepreg material must deform in a predictable and repeatable way so that defects such as wrinkles, folds, fibre splitting and excessive fibre misalignments can be avoided. To date, a lot of effort has been carried out towards the numerical modelling of the preforming process. Preforming analysis can generate useful information for predicting manufacturing defects, assist in the forming tool design and create input for subsequent stress analysis, resulting in global optimisation of the product and process development. Preforming of multi-layer pre-stacked thermoset prepregs requires deforming the different plies to a desirable shape. This process involved different deformation mechanisms such as intraply shear (shear within an individual ply), interply shear (or interply friction at the interface between neighbouring plies) and out-of-plane bending [7-9]. The accuracy of preforming simulations rely on the accurate description and characterisation of all of these deformation mechanisms.

Thermoset prepreg materials are well suited for the manufacture of complex automotive components. However, in the context of high-volume manufacturing, their implementation is facing many challenges. One of the main limitations is the lack of research and experimental data on the deformation behaviour of these materials, particularly under conditions similar to those found in high-volume processes. This work aims to characterise the frictional properties of two thermoset prepreg reinforcements at the ply/ply interface and determine the governing deformation mechanisms under different processing parameters. Two materials designed for high-volume, structural automotive applications were investigated: a 2x2 twill weave and a unidirectional carbon fibre material, both having the same resin system (i.e. a fast cure epoxy resin) allowing for a direct comparison of the effect of the reinforcement architecture on the interply friction behaviour. A testing rig was developed to deliver a fast heating rate (i.e. $80^{\circ}\text{C}.\text{min}^{-1}$), suitable for the characterisation of fast-curing prepreg materials. The test conditions of relative slip velocity used in this investigation are significantly higher than those used in previous studies and are representative of high-volume composite processing. In addition, the normal pressures considered are relevant to preforming process such as double-diaphragm forming. This permits the implementation of the characterisation data on friction mechanisms for higher volume applications. The interface morphology was analysed using microscopy to explain the different frictional behaviour. Based on these results, the influence of the processing parameters on the interply friction mechanism of different prepreg systems and implications on the test method were discussed. While the friction behaviour at the interface ply/tool [10, 11], ply/diaphragm and diaphragm/tool [12] has been reported to influence the forming behaviour, it was not considered in the present study.

2. Review of previous work

2.1. Friction mechanisms and characterisation methods

When preforming multi-layered prepregs, relative sliding of the plies might occur due to the presence of curved geometries. However, if sliding is prevented, compressive forces might build-up within the plies on the inside of a curve, leading to out-of-plane buckling. Previous studies [13-16] showed that processing parameters (i.e. temperature, forming rate and normal pressure) as well as material parameters (i.e. fibre lay-up and resin properties) significantly

influence the interply friction coefficient. This results in cumbersome experimental work when one needs to perform a complete experimental characterisation. There exist two main friction models: Coulomb and hydrodynamic friction [14, 17]. Coulomb friction occurs between dry surfaces and is proportional to the normal pressure and independent of the sliding velocity while hydrodynamic friction occurs between two surfaces completely separated by a thin layer of fluid, and is as such generally shear rate dependent. Although there are standards to determine the coefficient of friction of plastic film and sheet, such as the ASTM D1894 [18], these do not take into account the influence of the fibrous reinforcement (i.e. architecture and orientation) and the resin. In addition, the ASTM D1894 only considers Coulomb friction. Therefore, most research on friction of composite materials uses non-standard custom built rigs, based on the pull-through or pull-out method [19]. A schematic of the pull-out method is shown in Figure 1. This method was first developed by Murtagh et al. [14] while testing the friction occurring between tooling and adjacent plies. A central specimen is drawn out from between two pressure plates, leaving a gap that introduces normal pressure inhomogeneity.




Figure 1: Schematic of the pull-out test method

The pull-through method is shown in Figure 2, and was developed by Wilks [20]. It consists of two fixed platens, and a moving platen, which clamps the specimen and is connected to a load cell. In that case, the specimen is pulled through the platens and the normal pressure stays constant.




Figure 2: (a) photo of pull-through rig. (b) Schematic of top view of the rig

Recently, an alternative approach of measuring the friction behaviour of composite material was presented, using a commercial rheometer [21]. Although this method allows the production of accurate data at a fast rate, the pressure and rate achieved with this method are much lower than those typically obtained during preforming. Irrespective of the material and test method, load-displacement curves typically exhibit an initial peak followed by a steady state, corresponding to the static and dynamic friction, respectively [13, 19, 22, 23]. An exception has been observed for low displacement rate, where the static friction becomes indistinguishable. The static friction force is the force required to initiate slipping between adjacent plies while the dynamic friction is the force required to maintain sliding. In the absence of a standard test method, a benchmark study was conducted by seven institutions in order to compare friction test results using various test set-ups [24]. The different research groups determined the coefficient of friction between a metal surface and Twintex®PP (a thermoplastic composite of commingled glass fibre and polypropylene filaments) using the same test conditions at room temperature (dry friction) and elevated temperature (wet friction). For the dry friction coefficient, a difference of up to 32% between the participants was reported. In addition, in the case of dry friction tests, only the dynamic friction was stated as the static friction could not be determined by every research group. Regarding the wet friction, a relatively better agreement was found for the static friction than for the dynamic friction, which is thought to be due to boundary conditions and uneven pressure. These differences stress the need for a standard test method. In addition,

while this benchmark study mostly applies for ply/tool, a similar study would be required for the friction behaviour of thermoset material at the ply/ply interface.

2.2. Friction in thermoplastic composite forming

To date, a great majority of studies on friction behaviour of prepreg material have concerned thermoplastic composites [14, 15, 17, 20, 22, 25]. Thus, interply friction of thermoplastic composites is relatively well understood, and is generally considered as hydrodynamic [26]. Interply slippage is assumed to occur in a resin-rich layer between the plies, also described as a Couette flow, i.e. a viscous flow between two parallel plates [27]. This phenomenon was also demonstrated by Murtagh et al. [25] while investigating the interply slip mechanism of unidirectional thermoplastic material that occurs during press-forming. In the same study, they also observed a dependence of the reinforcement type (unidirectional and woven) on the frictional behaviour. From ply pull-out experiments, it was shown that the fabric material showed an initial stretching of the ply due to the crimp, followed by a shear rate dependent stationary friction (i.e. dynamic friction), while unidirectional materials show no initial fibre stretching. Such influence of the reinforcement architecture on the frictional behaviour had previously been observed by Ajayi [28], while studying the effect of woven fabric structure on frictional properties. He found that an increase in the yarn sett (i.e. the number of yarns per unit length) resulted in an increase in frictional resistance. In addition, it was found that friction coefficients depend on temperature and sliding velocity at elevated temperature only, supporting the assumption of a hydrodynamic lubrication mode. Also, it was observed that increasing normal pressure resulted in lower friction coefficient [14]. The dependence of the friction coefficient on temperature (i.e. matrix viscosity), normal pressure and velocity led Chow [29], to make use of a Stribeck curve to interpret his experimental data. A Stribeck curve is a plot of the coefficient of friction as a function of the Hersey number expressed as:

$$H = \frac{\eta v}{p} \quad (1)$$

where η is the viscosity of the lubricating fluid, v is the velocity and p is the normal force acting on the contact surface. Figure 3 illustrates a typical Stribeck curve and shows the three different lubrication regimes, i.e. boundary lubrication (the film fluid is negligible, resulting in friction

similar to Coulomb friction), elasto-hydrodynamic lubrication (mixed-mode lubrication) and hydrodynamic or full-film lubrication (surfaces are completely separated by a fluid film). The Stribeck curve provides a qualitative explanation of the mechanism governing friction for a range of processing parameters (i.e. normal pressure, slip velocity and resin viscosity through temperature of the plies) by plotting the friction coefficient as a function of the Hersey number. The Stribeck theory has been used by several researchers to analyse and model the friction behaviour of composite materials [30-32].




Figure 3: Typical Stribeck curve showing the different lubrication regimes

2.3. Friction in thermoset composite forming

Unlike thermoplastic material, literature on friction properties of thermoset material is relatively scarce. Most recent contributions are limited to unidirectional reinforcements [13]. In addition, the few published papers merely apply to processes destined for the aerospace industry [13, 23, 33]. As such, the range of parameters used is not applicable to high volume manufacturing processes (e.g., extremely slow slip velocities were used together with normal pressure obtained in autoclave). Martin et al. [23], studied the frictional properties of three aerospace graded woven thermoset prepreg at the ply/ply interface, in order to understand the influence of the interply slip on core crush of autoclaved honeycomb sandwich structure. Using a pull-through test at a temperature and pressure representative of a typical autoclave cure cycle (i.e. pressure ranging from 200 kPa to 500 kPa) it was found that the frictional forces of the prepreg helps prevent core crush by limiting slip, no mention of the slip velocity was made. It was also found that friction coefficient depends on the prepreg system as well as the temperature. Prepreg with higher resin viscosity together with a high amount of resin at the surface showed

lower frictional resistance. As the temperature increases, the resistance to slip decreases until a minimum, which suggests that interactions between the surfaces occur, most likely by interaction between the fibres from the plies in contact. This phenomenon was also noticed by Ersoy et al. [33]. They investigated the frictional properties of a unidirectional carbon/epoxy aerospace graded material in order to understand the effect leading to the formation of residual stresses within parts manufactured by an autoclave process. A pull-out test with a rate between 0.01 and 0.10 mm/min, a normal pressure of 700 kPa and a varying temperature were used in order to simulate the autoclave curing cycle. At the ply/ply interface, they found that the lay-up has an influence in the frictional properties, and particularly that the presence of 90° plies in a [0/90]_s lay-up increases interfacial shear stress due to mechanical interlocking between opposing fibres. Similarly, Akermo et al. [34], while characterising the frictional behaviour of a UD carbon/epoxy prepreg observed that [0/0] interfaces provide generally lower or similar interply friction to [0/90] interfaces. Of all lay-up considered, the [0/45] interfaces showed the highest interply friction. While studying the interply friction of thermoset unidirectional materials, Larberg et al. [13], observed a friction behaviour more complex than purely hydrodynamic, as opposed to thermoplastic material. One of the materials tested exhibited a rate independent behaviour, indicating boundary lubrication. It was also found that the friction coefficient decreased with normal pressure until reaching a steady value, typical of a boundary lubrication mode. Friction load versus displacement curves obtained during a friction test were reported over a maximum cross-head displacement of 2.5 mm. However, in some cases, relative slip between plies when preforming a part can reach more than 70 mm [35]. It is important to study the evolution of the friction properties over the maximum possible range of interply slip, particularly in the case of woven material, where interactions and movements between the tows in contact are expected due to the architecture of the material.

3. Materials and methods

3.1. Materials investigated

The materials used in this study are a unidirectional and a 2x2 twill weave reinforcement architectures for thermoset prepreg systems. The unidirectional material has a fibre areal weight of 250 g/m², a 15k tow-size and a resin content of 30% by weight while the woven material has a fibre areal weight of 400 g/m², a 12k tow-size and a resin content of 40% by weight. The prepreg materials investigated are based on the same epoxy rapid cure thermoset resin, which allows for a direct comparison of the reinforcement effect on the interply friction properties. Indeed, it has been shown that friction coefficient depends on resin viscosity which itself depends on the chemistry. Consequently, at a given temperature, the viscosity of different prepreg materials can vary [13]. Both materials are commercially available and have been specifically designed for compression moulding and high volume applications. Typical curing time is 5 minutes at 140°C but can be adjusted depending on the moulding temperature. Figure 4 shows images of the prepreg materials. Due to the high reactivity of the resin, differential scanning calorimetry (DSC) analysis was carried out in order to investigate the relationship between the onset of cure and time. For a given temperature, this method allows for the determination of the maximum allowable heating time before the initiation of cure. The results are then used as an upper bound for the friction test soaking time. Past the onset of cure, the resin viscosity starts rising and prevents material deformation and ply slippage during preforming.






Figure 4: Materials tested: (a) 12k 2x2 Twill thermoset prepreg. (b) 15k unidirectional thermoset prepreg

3.2. Test rig setup

The interply friction was measured using a specifically designed test rig. The apparatus is shown in Figure 5, and consists of two parallel, stationary outer platens and one moving centre platen. Due to the high thermal masses and the packaging size of the rig, it was found that using a thermal chamber alone, a soaking time of an hour was required in order to reach a temperature of 80°C at the interface between the plies. Considering the high reactivity of the material and for practical reasons, this was not suitable. Therefore, the test rig has been equipped with a closed loop temperature control system, consisting of a two zone temperature controller and cartridge heaters producing a total of 4,400 watts and allowing to heat the rig at a temperature of 80°C in a minute. The centre plate is fitted to a 500N load cell, attached to the cross-head of an Instron 5800R. The cross-head moves at a constant set velocity and its displacement is recorded every 0.1 seconds. Normal pressure upon the material is applied by means of four linear compression springs that can be tightened or loosened using nuts. The pressure is adjusted to a set value by controlling the linear displacement of the springs together with the torque applied to the adjusting nuts. Three prepreg specimens were used for each test: one sample was wrapped around the moving platen and two samples were mounted and clamped on the outer platen. The resultant testing contact surface area was 8,192 mm² and remained constant throughout the duration of the test. When testing the unidirectional material, specimens on the outer platens can be oriented at 0° and 90° to the pulling direction, making it possible to test the friction properties between different relative fibre orientations (i.e. either 0°/90° interface or 0°/0°). For the unidirectional material, the specimen on the centre platen can only be mounted with its fibre parallel to the pulling direction. Other orientations would lead to tearing the specimen apart due to the lack of integrity in the transverse direction.



(a)



(b)

Figure 5: Interply friction rig: (a) schematic of the rig showing working principles. (b) Picture of the rig

To start a test, the prepreg material specimens were first placed and clamped on the platens. The normal force was then adjusted and the rig was heated up to 80°C. Initial tests using a set of thermocouples located at the ply/ply interfaces showed that a soaking time of 2 minutes was sufficient to ensure a homogeneous temperature distribution at the testing surfaces. Then, the tangential load and the displacement were measured. At least three samples were tested for each test condition.

3.3. Friction test variables

In the present study, all specimens were tested at a temperature of 80°C, which is a typical preforming temperature [36]. A higher temperature would lead to the initiation of the curing process while a lower temperature would result in a high resin viscosity. Both situations would hinder shearing of the resin, ultimately preventing the ability of the material to deform during preforming. The viscosity-temperature curve for the resin investigated is shown in Figure 6. It can be seen that from room temperature to 80°C, the viscosity drops drastically by approximately three orders of magnitude.




Figure 6: Viscosity-temperature curve for the resin used

While an increase of the temperature would further decrease the viscosity, the time-temperature dependence of the viscosity in Figure 7 shows that at a higher temperature, i.e. 110°C, the resin reactivity significantly increases and could become a limiting factor when preforming. Interply friction tests were carried out using three different velocities: 1, 5 and 10 mm/s and four different normal pressures, 25, 50, 75 and 100 kPa. The velocities and pressure used conform to the preforming conditions suitable for press-forming and double diaphragm forming.




Figure 7: Isothermal viscosity profile at 80°C and 110°C

In addition it has been shown that the resin behaves as a Newtonian fluid, i.e. the viscosity is independent of the shear velocity whilst the shear stresses increase linearly with increasing shear velocity.

4. Results and discussion

The results of the friction tests are presented and explained in the next sections. The effect of normal pressure and sliding velocity on the frictional behaviour of the two materials are discussed and compared. For each unique set of test variables, the experimental results were averaged over three samples. The error bars represent one standard deviation on either side of the averaged results. For clarity's sake, all data presented on each figure has been plotted on the same scale.

4.1. Unidirectional material

Figure 8 shows load versus displacement graphs, which illustrate the influence of the normal pressure on the frictional behaviour of unidirectional material, tested at different sliding rate. For all tests, the fibre orientation at the contact interface was $0^\circ/90^\circ$. Although it was reported previously that other relative fibre orientations have an influence on the frictional behaviour of thermoset, only one interface was considered for this study. It can be observed that irrespective of the normal pressure and the sliding velocity, the results exhibit the same general trend. First, the frictional force increases rapidly up to a maximum peak, corresponding to the static friction or the force required to initiate sliding between surfaces. Secondly, the force decreases and eventually reaches a steady state, corresponding to the dynamic friction. For each test rate, both the static and the dynamic friction forces increase with increasing normal pressure (Figure 8). As the normal pressure increases, higher tangential forces are required to pull the adjacent surfaces apart. It can also be observed that the spread of the static friction seems to be pressure and rate dependent. As the normal pressure increases, the static friction peak spreads over a greater displacement (Figure 8). This trend is particularly noticeable for medium to high sliding velocity, i.e. 5 and 10 mm.s^{-1} where the spread ranges from approximately 10 mm displacement at 25 kPa to 30 mm displacement at 100 kPa. At a test rate of 1 mm.s^{-1} , this phenomenon is less obvious. In addition, the amplitude of the static friction with respect to the dynamic plateau decreases with increasing pressure. Indeed, for a given test speed, the ratio between the static friction load and the dynamic friction load is greater at 25 kPa than 100 kPa. Therefore, the effect of normal pressure on the frictional behaviour is different on the static

friction and the dynamic friction. This is because both types of friction arise from different mechanisms. Static friction has been associated with adhesion mechanisms and chemical interactions between opposing surfaces [37]. At an atomic-scale, static friction is non-existent between two clean crystalline surfaces under ultra-high vacuum. However, at a macroscopic scale, two objects sliding against each other always exhibit static friction. Gang et al. [38], proposed an explanation whereby there exist “third bodies” in the form of adsorbed molecules, that act to lock the two contacting surfaces together that have been exposed to air. It was also shown that static friction is an exponential function of time. The longer the surfaces are in contact, the higher the static friction coefficient [39]. One possible explanation is that when surfaces stay stationary, the lubricant (i.e. the resin in this case) is drawn into the cavities, leading to higher meniscus force and consequently higher static friction. Similarly, an increase in normal pressure will force the resin into these cavities, increasing wetting between mating surfaces and therefore increasing static friction. The time-dependency of the static friction behaviour was not investigated in this study. However, the effect of time was controlled using a constant soaking time between each test. Dynamic friction on the other hand is related to energy losses created at the interface during sliding [40]. It is interesting to note that all curves, except those tested at 10 mm.s^{-1} appear jagged rather than smooth, past the static peak. This phenomenon is a characteristic of stick-slip frictional behaviour and has also been observed with woven fabrics [28, 41]. Stick-slip can be explained by the successive formation and rupturing of new interfaces between two surfaces, leading to the occurrence of static friction peaks and sliding. This phenomenon is time-dependent and seems to disappear at higher sliding speed as there is not sufficient time for the formation of adhesion contacts to occur resulting in a smooth sliding [42].




Figure 8: Influence of the normal pressure on the frictional load for the UD material tested at:

1 mm.s⁻¹, 5 mm.s⁻¹ and 10 mm.s⁻¹

Figure 9 shows the influence of the sliding rate on the frictional behaviour of unidirectional material, tested at different normal pressures. It can be observed that for a given normal pressure, the static and dynamic friction behaviour is velocity dependent. For each normal pressure, the static and dynamic friction forces increase as the sliding velocity increases. This suggests the presence of lubricated, viscous sliding rather than boundary lubrication effects.




Figure 9: Influence of the sliding velocity on the frictional load for the UD material tested at 25 kPa, 50 kPa, 75 kPa and 100 kPa

This can be directly related to the presence of the viscous, shear rate dependent resin. However, it is interesting to see that the evolution of the dynamic friction with increasing slipping rate is less obvious for the specimens tested at 25 kPa than that observed for the specimens tested at higher normal pressures. In other words, the effect of rate dependence tends to become smaller at 25 kPa. The ratio between the dynamic loads measured at 10 mm.s⁻¹ and 1 mm.s⁻¹ is approximately 1.46 at a normal pressure of 25 kPa while it varies between 2.26 and 2.50 for other normal pressures suggesting that the friction modes may be different. The use of a low normal pressure of 25 kPa may create higher surface roughness at the interface between two plies, resulting in larger dry contact areas. On the other hand, higher normal pressures may force the resin to migrate through the reinforcement towards the contact interface forming a

resin film and providing a lubricated, rate dependent mode of friction. In contrast, the relative evolution of the static friction as a function of the sliding rate is similar for each normal pressure. For all normal pressures considered, the ratio of the static load measured at 10 mm.s⁻¹ to the load measured at 1 mm.s⁻¹ varies between 2.25 to 2.43.

The evolution of the static and dynamic friction coefficients as a function of the different parameters investigated is shown in Figure 10. The friction coefficients were calculated such that:

$$\mu = \frac{F}{2 \times a \times N} \quad (2)$$

where, F is the tangential load read by the load cell, a is the surface area of the two side plates and N is the normal pressure. The tangential load used for the calculation of the static friction coefficients corresponds to the highest load obtained from the load versus displacement traces. For the determination of the dynamic friction coefficients, the load used for the calculation corresponds to the average of the loads ranging between the intersection of the tangent of the peak with the plateau to the end of the test. It can be seen that both the static and the dynamic friction coefficients increase with increasing sliding velocity and decrease with increasing normal pressure. The friction coefficient-velocity relationship is quasi-linear, which suggests that friction is characterised by shearing of the Newtonian epoxy matrix present at the interface (i.e. by definition, shear stresses increase linearly with increasing shear rate). In contrast, in all cases but the dynamic friction tested at 10 mm.s⁻¹, friction coefficients show an asymptotic relationship with the normal pressure. Both static and dynamic friction coefficients decrease with increasing normal pressure before reaching a minimum value and plateau.




Figure 10: Evolution of the static (top) and dynamic (bottom) friction coefficients as a function of velocity (left) and normal pressure (right)

One explanation is that for low normal pressures, interlocking and nesting between opposing fibres having initially circular cross-section is likely to occur, resulting in a rough surface contact. However, for higher normal pressures, opposing fibres as well as any asperities at the interface will be flattened out, resulting in a reduction of the roughness and consequently, the friction coefficients. This was also observed in [13] and [43] in the case of UD thermoset prepreg and dry woven fabrics, respectively. Upon increasing normal pressure, no further compaction seems possible as the coefficient values plateau. This behaviour corresponds to the region characteristic of a hydrodynamic regime (see Stribeck curve Figure 3), where the friction coefficients decrease with increasing normal pressure and increase with increasing sliding speed. Dark-field micrographs of the cross-section of specimens along the sliding direction,

taken after a test are shown in Figure 11 and correspond to specimens tested with a normal pressure of 25 and 100 kPa on the left and the right side, respectively.

The dividing area between the specimen mount and the sample correspond to the black lines at either side of the specimen. For both tests with a normal pressure of 25 kPa and 100 kPa, there does not seem to be any voids within the plies (characterised by dark and round-shaped spots). This suggests that the plies are fully impregnated and that therefore, some degree of lubrication was present during the tests. The interface is perfectly discernible and no disturbances and interactions between the fibres are visible. The distance reported on the micrographs show that a normal pressure of 100 kPa leads to a greater degree of compaction compared to a lower normal pressure. The global laminate thickness after performing the test with a normal pressure of 100 kPa is 449 μm on average, while it was 482 μm on average for the test with a normal pressure of 25 kPa. Figure 12 summarises the friction coefficient data for both the static and dynamic states for the unidirectional material.




Figure 11: Cross-section micrographs showing the interface between two UD plies after a friction test performed with a normal pressure of 25 kPa (a), and 100 kPa (b) – (x10)




Figure 12: Friction coefficients summary for the UD material tested at different velocities and normal pressures.

4.2. Woven material

The woven material was tested under the same conditions as those used for the UD material. All tests were performed with the warp direction parallel to the sliding direction. Indeed it was seen that pulling the material along the weft direction increases the risk of damaging the fabric [44]. Figure 13 shows the effect of normal pressure on the tangential load for different sliding velocity values.




Figure 13: Influence of the normal pressure on the frictional load for the Woven material tested at: 1 mm.s^{-1} , 5 mm.s^{-1} and 10 mm.s^{-1}

Similar to the UD material, for a given sliding speed, the tangential load increases with increasing normal pressure. However, the evolution of the tangential load exhibits a different trend depending on the test condition. At a sliding velocity of 1 mm.s^{-1} , it can be seen that initially, the load increases rapidly up to a peak of local maximum. Past the initial peak, the load decreases before increasing again to reach a plateau at a displacement of approximately 20 mm. The load decrease is particularly more distinct for higher normal pressures, i.e. 75 kPa and 100 kPa. This is most likely due to initial movement and displacement of the specimens relative to the platen on which they are supported, as the test begins. This is also accompanied by

uncrimping of the tows. Until the material is fully taut, it is difficult to interpret the data as the tangential loads result from a combination of different mechanisms. As a consequence, the transition from static to dynamic friction is not obvious, and therefore, only the dynamic friction will be reported in the next sections. At a sliding velocity of 5 and 10 mm.s⁻¹, the general shape of the load-displacement curves is more similar to that of the UD material at similar test conditions in that there is no significant load decrease before the occurrence of the dynamic regime, i.e. after approximately 20 mm extension.

Figure 14 shows the influence of the sliding rate on the load-displacement curves at different normal pressures. It can be seen that the effect of the sliding velocity mostly affects the evolution of the tangential force over the first 20 mm of displacement, for the tests performed with a high normal pressure. However, past this point, the effect of the sliding velocity on the dynamic friction forces of the woven material is relatively small, unlike the UD material, and decrease with increasing normal pressure. Because both prepreg reinforcements have the same resin system, i.e. a fast cure epoxy resin, this different behaviour suggests that the interply slip process of the two materials involves different mechanisms and is affected by the reinforcement architecture. While the general trend of the load-displacement curves of the UD material is similar irrespective of the test conditions, it largely differs on the normal pressure for the woven material.

This different behaviour is directly related to the structure of the woven material. Evaluation of the specimen after tests revealed that the interply friction of woven prepreg at high normal pressure is accompanied with significant localised movement of transverse tows. Figure 15 shows two specimens after a friction test performed with a sliding rate of 1 mm.s⁻¹ and a normal pressure of 25 kPa (a) and 100 kPa (b). The specimen tested with a normal pressure of 25 kPa shows no sign of tow displacement. In contrast, the specimen tested with a normal pressure of 100 kPa shows a transverse tow that has been pulled-out along the sliding direction.




Figure 14: Influence of the sliding velocity on the frictional load for the Woven material tested at 25 kPa, 50 kPa, 75 kPa and 100 kPa

Because the transverse tows are free at both their ends, they have a higher propensity to move due to frictional forces, as compared to the longitudinal fibres that are restricted by the clamping. In this case, displacement of transverse tows is solely due to frictional forces exerted by the mating surface. During preforming of woven reinforcements, this deformation mode can occur and typically results to in-plane waviness. In practise, such issues can be overcome using techniques that increase axial tensions in the tows and limit in-plane waviness and wrinkling. These typically include blank holders and grippers for matched die forming and vacuum pressure for double diaphragm forming. The development of tensile and compressive forces within the tows of a fabric reinforcement will strongly influence the frictional behaviour of woven

material. Indeed, increasing axial tension in the warp and weft tows will reduce crimp and consequently flatten the surface of the ply, while a relatively loose tow will be more likely to move, similar to that seen in Figure 15b.




Figure 15: Pictures of a twill woven specimen after a friction test at 1 mm.s^{-1} performed with a normal pressure of (a) 25 kPa and (b) 100 kPa.

This observation raises important, new implications for the characterisation of the frictional properties of woven materials, particularly when applied for preforming processes involving high normal pressure such as double diaphragm forming. In order to get accurate and representative data, an understanding of all stresses within the fabric is required. The present investigation considers the particular case where tension of transverse tows is negligible.

Similar to the UD material, friction coefficients can be calculated from the tangential loads.

Figure 16 summarises the evolution of the dynamic friction coefficients as a function of sliding velocity and normal pressure. Firstly, it can be seen that the evolution of the dynamic friction coefficients with normal pressure depends on the sliding velocity. While the results from the tests performed at 1 and 10 mm.s^{-1} exhibit a similar and expected trend, i.e. the dynamic friction coefficients decrease with increasing normal pressure similar to the UD material, the tests performed at 5 mm.s^{-1} do not show such a clear trend. In addition, the effect of the sliding velocity on the dynamic friction coefficients varies depending on the normal pressure. For lower normal pressures of 25 and 50 kPa, the dynamic friction coefficient remains constant with a sliding velocity of 1 and 5 mm.s^{-1} , while a further increase of the sliding velocity leads to an

increase of the dynamic friction coefficient. For a normal pressure of 75 kPa, the frictional behaviour seems rate dependent as the friction coefficient increases with increasing testing rate.




Figure 16: Dynamic friction coefficients summary for the Woven material at different test conditions.

For a normal pressure of 100 kPa, it can be seen that the evolution of the sliding velocity on the dynamic friction coefficients is almost negligible. Indeed, the dynamic friction coefficients are similar at 1 and 10 mm.s⁻¹. This suggests that for normal pressures similar to those obtained during double diaphragm forming, i.e. 1 bar, the frictional properties of the woven material are

rate independent, and that the material behaves as a dry reinforcement, unlike the UD material. This is rather unexpected as the woven material has a higher resin content by weight than the UD material. One possible explanation can be related to the manufacturing process of out-of-autoclave prepreg material and their different degree of impregnation. It was demonstrated in [45], that some OOA reinforcements are only partially impregnated and exhibit resin rich areas on both outer surfaces of the ply, while the centre remains dry and porous. The porous medium is sometimes referred to as engineered vacuum channels (EVaCs) and facilitates migration of trapped air and gas towards the boundaries of the ply in the early moulding stage. During compaction, the dry areas are then progressively infiltrated with resin to produce a void-free structure. Scanning electron microscopy (SEM) micrograph of the cross-section of the woven in the as-received state is shown in Figure 17a. A micrograph of the UD specimen was added in Figure 17b for comparison. Specimens were imaged using a Sigma Zeiss FEG SEM under InLens imaging mode with a 20 kV accelerating voltage. Samples were placed on an aluminium stub coated with adhesive carbon tape and held vertically using mounting clips to image the cross-section of the specimen. Samples were sputter coated with Pd/Au prior to imaging. The woven prepreg shows a thick layer of resin on either side of the ply (locations 1 and 2 in figure 17a). In addition, the lack of consolidation between the warp and weft fibres (locations 3 and 4, respectively, in figure 17a) reveals dry fibres underneath the cross-sectional surface (location 5 in figure 17a), sign of a poor resin impregnation through-the-thickness. On the contrary, the UD specimen shows a more uniform resin impregnation. Although a relatively greater resin content in either side of the specimen (locations 6 and 7 in figure 17b), and a lack of compaction (location 8, figure 17b) can be observed, no dry fibres are visible, indicating complete impregnation.




Figure 17: SEM micrograph of the cross-section of (a) the woven prepreg (x60) and (b) the UD prepreg (x250), in their as-received, uncured state.

High normal pressure exerted during friction tests of the woven prepreg caused the resin on both surfaces to squeeze out of the contact interface between the two plies. Figure 18 shows the surface of a specimen after a friction test performed with a normal pressure of 100 kPa. On the top half of the picture, a relatively thick and shiny layer of resin can be observed and corresponds to an area of the ply that has not been in contact with another ply. In contrast, the bottom half of the picture show dry fibres and corresponds to an area of the specimen that was in contact with the mating surface during the friction test. Consequently, with a normal pressure of 100 kPa, the contact interface was not fully lubricated. When testing frictional properties of a dry carbon twill weave reinforcement at 5 mm.s^{-1} Allaoui et al. [46], found a dynamic friction coefficient of approximately 0.3, similar to the one obtained in this study at 100 kPa. This confirms the assumption that the frictional properties of the woven prepreg at high normal pressure are similar to those of a dry fabric.





Figure 18: Picture showing the surface of a ply after a friction test performed with a normal pressure of 100 kPa and the resin squeeze out effect.

SEM micrographs of the cross-section of a specimen taken after a test performed with a normal pressure of 25 kPa and 100 kPa are shown in Figure 19. The dashed white lines represent the interface between the two woven plies (locations 1 and 2 in figure 19). For the specimen at 25 kPa, the fibres can be seen within a thick layer of resin, particularly near the interface (location 3 in figure 19a). Lack of compaction due to low normal pressure can be seen at the interface between the warp and weft of the ply located at the left-hand side of the micrograph (location 4 in figure 19a). In contrast, the micrograph of the specimen tested at a normal pressure of 100 kPa shows a relatively dry interface. Unlike the other specimen, the fibres at the interface can be seen individually and do not seem to be immersed within the resin (location 5 in figure 19b). In addition, resin rich areas characterised by a shiny and milky appearance can be observed on both outer surfaces of the specimen (locations 6 and 7 in figure 19b). The higher normal pressure has caused the resin to migrate from the contact interface towards the outside of the specimen, leaving a dry interface.



(a)

(b)

Figure 19: Through-thickness cross-section SEM micrographs showing the interface between two plies of woven prepreg after a friction test performed with a normal pressure of (a) 25 kPa and (b) 100 kPa (x195). The white dotted lines represent the interface between the two woven plies

4.3. Stribeck analysis

Friction coefficients can be plotted as a function of the Hersey number which is a function of the normal pressure, viscosity and velocity. In that case the viscosity is of the bulk resin at 80°C. The curve generated can then be related to the Stribeck curve (see Figure 3). For the UD material, the curve corresponds to the hydrodynamic (full-film) lubrication mode (Figure 20). For the woven material however, a more complex behaviour is seen. A linear fitting gives a poor R-squared value, and cannot be linked to any specific lubrication regime. Consequently, depending on the test parameters the frictional behaviour of the woven prepreg extends across different types of lubrication regime.




Figure 20: Stribeck curve for the woven and unidirectional material

5. Conclusions and perspectives

The interply frictional behaviour of two prepreg materials designed for high-volume, structural automotive applications was measured using a dedicated rig. The prepreg materials investigated consisted of two different types of reinforcement, i.e. a woven twill and a UD reinforced prepreg both using the same rapid-cure epoxy resin system. The influence of the sliding velocity as well as the normal pressure, representative of those used for high-volume processing were investigated. It was shown that both reinforcements exhibit a significantly different behaviour. The UD material showed predictable results: (1) the friction coefficients increase with increasing sliding velocity due to the shear rate dependence of the resin at the contact interface and (2), the friction coefficients decrease with increasing normal pressure due to a reduction in global surface roughness at the interface. Stribeck curve analysis was used to predict the behaviour of the different materials. The UD material shows a hydrodynamic type of lubrication, i.e. the surfaces are kept apart by an unbroken film of lubrication.

In contrast, the woven material showed more complex results due to the nature of its architecture and the different mechanisms observed during the tests. Similar to the UD prepreg, friction coefficients seemed to decrease with increasing normal pressure. However, the influence of the sliding velocity was relatively different. While the material showed a slip rate dependence at low normal pressure, it behaves differently at high normal pressure. The partial

impregnation of the woven prepreg combined with a high normal pressure resulted in a frictional behaviour similar to that of a dry reinforcement. SEM micrographs of samples tested at 100 kPa showed resin migration towards the outside of the specimen, leaving a contact interface resin-starved and causing the reinforcement to behave as a dry fabric. Unlike the UD material, the woven prepreg does not fit within any particular regime of lubrication of the Stribeck curve. This highlighted the complex behaviour of the material and suggested that, depending on the sliding velocity and normal pressure conditions, the frictional behaviour of the woven material exhibits a different lubrication regime. In addition, analysis of woven test specimens at the macro-scale level revealed significant transverse tows movement when tested at high normal pressure highlighting the influence of axial tension within the warp and weft.

The findings of this work provide useful perspectives for further work: (1) it was seen that the occurrence of excessive tension within warp and weft led to the displacement and in-plane waviness of individual tows. This parameter needs to be further investigated and is of significant importance for preforming processes such as matched die forming and double diaphragm forming where the development of tension within the reinforcement occurs. Current friction test methods do not make it possible to adjust the tension in both warp and weft tows. (2) The partial impregnation of the woven material (i.e. the material is not uniformly impregnated across the whole thickness) combined with high normal pressure led to a migration of the resin towards the outer surfaces of the specimen. This behaviour is expected to be different for a fully impregnated material. Consequently, the influence of the degree of impregnation of the prepreg on its interply friction behaviour should be investigated. This parameter is particularly important for preforming processes such as double diaphragm forming where the laminate is typically preheated in between the diaphragm membranes under vacuum, thus modifying the impregnation level.

Acknowledgement

This work was jointly funded by EPSRC and Aston Martin Lagonda Ltd. under grant reference number 1500124. The authors wish to thank WMG and Aston Martin Lagonda Ltd. for their support. A particular thanks is addressed to Frederick Walker, Manager Body CAE at Aston Martin Lagonda Ltd., for his involvement in reviewing the progress of the work and appraising its relevance and applicability to Aston Martin Lagonda Ltd. R&D activities

References

1. Akiyama, K. *Development of PCM* technology*. in *SPE Automotive and Composites Divisions - 11th Annual Automotive Composites Conference and Exhibition, ACCE 2011*. 2011. Troy, Michigan, USA.
2. Malnati, P., *Prepreg compression molding makes its commercial debut*. High-Performance Composites, 2015(JUNE, 2015).
3. Pasco, C. and K. Kendall. *Characterisation of the thermoset prepreg compression moulding process*. in *SPE Automotive and Composites Divisions - 16th Annual Automotive Composites Conference and Exhibition, ACCE 2016*. 2016. Novi, Michigan, USA.
4. Khan, M.A., et al., *Processing of thermoset preregs for high-volume applications and their numerical analysis using superimposed finite elements*. Composite Structures, 2015. **131**: p. 917-926.
5. Bersee, H.E.N., et al. *Diaphragm forming of thermoset composites*.
6. Bernsdorf, M. *Process & Resin Development for BMW M4 GTS hood program*. in *SPE Automotive and Composites Divisions - 16th Annual Automotive Composites Conference and Exhibition, ACCE 2016*. 2016. Novi, Michigan, USA.
7. Boisse, P., et al., *Composites forming*, in *Advances in Material Forming*. 2007, Springer. p. 61-79.
8. Long, A.C., *Composites Forming Technologies*. Woodhead Publishing Series in Textiles. 2014: Elsevier Science.
9. Gereke, T., et al., *Experimental and computational composite textile reinforcement forming: A review*. Composites Part A: Applied Science and Manufacturing, 2013. **46**: p. 1-10.
10. Kaushik, V. and J. Raghavan, *Experimental study of tool-part interaction during autoclave processing of thermoset polymer composite structures*. Composites Part A: Applied Science and Manufacturing, 2010. **41**(9): p. 1210-1218.
11. Potter, K.D., et al., *The generation of geometrical deformations due to tool/part interaction in the manufacture of composite components*. Composites Part A: Applied Science and Manufacturing, 2005. **36**(2): p. 301-308.
12. Monaghan, M.R. and P.J. Mallon, *Study of polymeric diaphragm behaviour in autoclave processing of thermoplastic composites*. Broadening horizons with advanced materials and processes, 1993: p. 283-299.
13. Larberg, Y.R. and M. Åkermo, *On the interply friction of different generations of carbon/epoxy prepreg systems*. Composites Part A: Applied Science and Manufacturing, 2011. **42**(9): p. 1067-1074.
14. Murtagh, A.M., J.J. Lennon, and P.J. Mallon, *Surface friction effects related to pressforming of continuous fibre thermoplastic composites*. Composites Manufacturing, 1995. **6**(3-4): p. 169-175.
15. Scherer, R. and K. Friedrich, *Inter-and intraply-slip flow processes during thermoforming of CF/PP-laminates*. Composites Manufacturing, 1991. **2**(2): p. 92-96.
16. Larberg, Y.R., M. Åkermo, and M. Norrby, *On the in-plane deformability of cross-plyed unidirectional prepreg*. Journal of composite materials, 2012. **46**(8): p. 929-939.
17. Murtagh, A.M. and P.J. Mallon, *Chapter 5 Characterisation of shearing and frictional behaviour during sheet forming*, in *Composite Materials Series*, D. Bhattacharyya, Editor. 1997, Elsevier. p. 163-216.
18. *ASTM D1894-14, Standard Test Method for Static and Kinetic Coefficients of Friction of Plastic Film and Sheeting*. 2014, ASTM International: West Conshohocken, PA.

19. Harrison, P., et al., *Characterising and modelling tool-ply friction of viscous textile composites*. World Journal of Engineering, 2010. **7**(1): p. 5-22.
20. Wilks, C.E., *Processing technologies for woven glass/polypropylene composites*. 1999.
21. Lin, H., et al. *Investigation of tool-ply friction of viscous textile composites*. in *8th International Conference on Textile Composites, TexComp 2006*.
22. Morris, S.R. and C.T. Sun, *An investigation of interply slip behaviour in AS4/PEEK at forming temperatures*. Composites Manufacturing, 1994. **5**(4): p. 217-224.
23. Martin, C.J., J.C. Seferis, and M.A. Wilhelm, *Frictional resistance of thermoset prepregs and its influence on honeycomb composite processing*. Composites Part A: Applied Science and Manufacturing, 1996. **27**(10): p. 943-951.
24. Sachs, U., et al., *Characterization of the dynamic friction of woven fabrics: Experimental methods and benchmark results*. Composites Part A: Applied Science and Manufacturing, 2014. **67**: p. 289-298.
25. Murtagh, A.M. and P.J. Mallon. *Shear characterisation of unidirectional and fabric reinforced thermoplastic composites for pressforming applications*. in *10th ICCM Conference (Canada)*. 1995.
26. Vanclooster, K., S.V. Lomov, and I. Verpoest, *Simulation of multi-layered composites forming*. International Journal of Material Forming, 2010. **3**: p. 695-698.
27. Cattanaach, J.B. and F.N. Cogswell, *Processing with Aromatic Polymer Composites*, in *Developments in Reinforced Plastics—5: Processing and Fabrication*, G. Pritchard, Editor. 1986, Springer Netherlands: Dordrecht. p. 1-38.
28. Ajayi, J.O., *Effects of Fabric Structure on Frictional Properties*. Textile Research Journal, 1992. **62**(2): p. 87-93.
29. Chow, S., *Frictional interaction between blank holder and fabric in stamping of woven thermoplastic composites*. Department of Mechanical Engineering, 2002.
30. Aimene, Y., et al., *Hyperelastic approach for composite reinforcement forming simulations*. International Journal of Material Forming, 2008. **1**(1): p. 811-814.
31. Gorczyca, J.L., et al., *Modeling of friction and shear in thermostamping of composites-part I*. Journal of Composite Materials, 2004. **38**(21): p. 1911-1929.
32. Gorczyca-Cole, J.L., J.A. Sherwood, and J. Chen, *A friction model for thermostamping commingled glass–polypropylene woven fabrics*. Composites Part A: Applied Science and Manufacturing, 2007. **38**(2): p. 393-406.
33. Ersoy, N., et al., *An experimental method to study the frictional processes during composites manufacturing*. Composites Part A: Applied Science and Manufacturing, 2005. **36**(11): p. 1536-1544.
34. Åkermo, M., et al. *Influence of interply friction on the forming of stacked prepreg*. Curran Associates, Inc.
35. Allaoui, S., C. Cellard, and G. Hivet, *Effect of inter-ply sliding on the quality of multilayer interlock dry fabric preforms*. Composites Part A: Applied Science and Manufacturing, 2015. **68**: p. 336-345.
36. Akiyama, K. *Development of preforming process in PCM (Prepreg Compression Molding) technology*. in *SPE Automotive and Composites Divisions - 12th Annual Automotive Composites Conference and Exhibition, ACCE 2012*. 2012.
37. Zhang, Q., et al., *Origin of static friction and its relationship to adhesion at the atomic scale*. Physical Review B, 2007. **75**(14): p. 144114.
38. He, G., M.H. Müser, and M.O. Robbins, *Adsorbed Layers and the Origin of Static Friction*. Science, 1999. **284**(5420): p. 1650.
39. Tu, C.-F. and T. Fort, *A study of fiber-capstan friction. 2. Stick–slip phenomena*. Tribology International, 2004. **37**(9): p. 711-719.
40. Braun, O.M. and A.G. Naumovets, *Nanotribology: Microscopic mechanisms of friction*. Surface Science Reports, 2006. **60**(6–7): p. 79-158.

41. Hosseini Ravandi, S.A., K. Toriumi, and Y. Matsumoto, *Spectral analysis of the stick-slip motion of dynamic friction in the fabric surface*. Textile research journal, 1994. **64**(4): p. 224-229.
42. Drummond, C., J. Israelachvili, and P. Richetti, *Friction between two weakly adhering boundary lubricated surfaces in water*. Physical Review E, 2003. **67**(6): p. 066110.
43. Kalebek, N.A. and O. Babaarslan, *Effect of weight and applied force on the friction coefficient of the spunlace nonwoven fabrics*. Fibers and Polymers, 2010. **11**(2): p. 277-284.
44. Sachs, U., *Friction and bending in thermoplastic composites forming processes*. 2014: University of Twente.
45. Centea, T., L.K. Grunenfelder, and S.R. Nutt, *A review of out-of-autoclave prepregs – Material properties, process phenomena, and manufacturing considerations*. Composites Part A: Applied Science and Manufacturing, 2015. **70**: p. 132-154.
46. Allaoui, S., et al., *Influence of the dry woven fabrics meso-structure on fabric/fabric contact behavior*. Journal of Composite Materials, 2012. **46**(6): p. 627-639.